IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

GTECH CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

C.A. No. 04-138-JJF

SCIENTIFIC GAMES INTERNATIONAL, INC., SCIENTIFIC GAMES HOLDINGS CORPORATION, SCIENTIFIC GAMES FINANCE CORPORATION, and SCIENTIFIC GAMES CORPORATION,

Defendants.

SCIENTIFIC GAMES' PROPOSED JURY VERDICT FORM

Pursuant to D. Del. L.R. 51.1(c), defendants hereby submit the following proposed jury verdict form.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL

/s/ Rodger D. Smith II

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Rodger D. Smith II (#3778)
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347
(302) 658-9200
rsmith@mnat.com
Attorneys for Defendants

January 13, 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

GTECH CORPORATION,				
Plaintiff,				
v.	C.A. No. 04-138-JJF			
SCIENTIFIC GAMES INTERNATIONAL, INC., SCIENTIFIC GAMES HOLDINGS CORPORATION, SCIENTIFIC GAMES FINANCE CORPORATION, and SCIENTIFIC GAMES CORPORATION, Defendants.				
<u>VERDICT FORM</u>				
We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:				
I. INFRINGEMENT/NON-INFRINGEMENT				
Answer the following questions regarding the infringement of the patents-in-suit with a "Yes" or a "No." A "Yes" answer is a finding for GTECH. A "No" answer is a finding for Scientific Games.				
1. Do you find that GTECH	1. Do you find that GTECH has proven by a preponderance of the evidence			
that Scientific Games' PlayCentral Kiosk infringes claim 20 of the '337 patent?				
Yes	No			
2. Do you find that GTECH	I has proven by a preponderance of the evidence			
that Scientific Games' PlayCentral Kiosk infringes claim 21 of the '337 patent?				

No _____

Yes _____

	3.	Do you find that GTECH ha	s proven by a preponderance of the evidence
that Scientific	Games	' PlayCentral Kiosk infringes	claim 18 of the '624 patent?
		Yes	No
II. VALII	DITY/I	NVALIDITY	
"Yes" or a ". finding for GT	No." 2	r the following questions rega A "Yes" answer is a finding	erding the validity of the patents-in-suit with a for Scientific Games. A "No" answer is a
	1.	Do you find that Scientific	Games has proven by clear and convincing
evidence that	the foll	owing claims of the '337 pater	nt are invalid for anticipation?
		Claim Yes 20 21	No
	2.	Do you find that Scientific	Games has proven by clear and convincing
evidence that	claim 1	8 of the '624 patent is invalid	for anticipation?
		Yes	No
	3.	Do you find that Scientific	Games has proven by clear and convincing
evidence that	the foll	lowing claims of the '337 pate	nt are invalid for obviousness?
		Claim Yes 20 21	No
	4.	Do you find that Scientific	Games has proven by clear and convincing
evidence that	claim 1	18 of the '624 patent is invalid	for obviousness?
		Yes	No

	5.	Do you find that Scientific	Games has proven by clear and convincing
evidence that	claim 1	8 of the '624 patent is invalid	for indefiniteness?
		Yes	No
III. DAM	AGES		
you have for	valid ai ind in S	nd infringed, vour deliberatio	I II that none of the claims of the patents-in- ns are completed, and you may stop here. If one claim of the patents-in-suit is infringed testions on damages.
	1.	Do you find that GTECH has	s proven by a preponderance of evidence that
it is entitled	to collec	t lost profits damages from Sc	ientific Games?
		Yes	No
If your answ	ver is "	Yes," what amount of lost pr	rofits damages do you find that GTECH has
proven by a	prepond	erance of the evidence?	
		\$	
	2.	If you have found that GTI	ECH did not prove that it is entitled to collect
lost profits	damages	s for some or all of the infrir	iging sales, what is the amount of reasonable
royalty dam	ages tha	t GTECH has proven by a pre	ponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to
collect for the	nose infi	ringing sales for which lost pro	fits were not awarded?
		\$	

IV. WILLFULNESS

Answer the following question regarding willfulness with a "Yes" or a "No." A "Yes" answer is a finding for GTECH. A "No" answer is a finding for Scientific Games.

1. Has GTECH sho	own by clear and convincing evidence that, based on the
totality of the circumstances, Scientific	c Games willfully infringed the asserted claims?
Yes	No
We, the jury, unanimou	asly so find on the foregoing questions.
Dated:	
Jury Foreperson	Juror
Juror	
499274	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on January 13, 2006, he caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following:

Josy W. Ingersoll Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor LLP The Brandywine Building 1000 West Street, 17th Floor P.O. Box 391 Wilmington, DE 19899

and that I caused copies to be served upon the following in the manner indicated:

BY HAND

Josy W. Ingersoll Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor, LLP The Brandywine Building 1000 West Street, 17th Floor P.O. Box 391 Wilmington, DE 19899

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

Thomas J. Meloro, Esquire Kenyon & Kenyon One Broadway New York, NY 10004

/s/ Rodger D. Smith II

Rodger D. Smith II (#3778) Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP 1201 N. Market Street P.O. Box 1347 Wilmington, DE 19899 (302) 658-9200 rsmith@mnat.com